REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 13, 2009. Claims 16-32 were pending in the application prior to the outstanding Office Action.

In this reply, Claims 30 and 32 have been amended. Claims 16-32 remain for the Examiner's consideration.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 16-32 are rejected based on non-statutory double patenting rejection over Claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,968. A rejection based on a non-statutory type of double patenting can be avoided by filing a terminal disclaimer in the application or proceeding in which the rejection is made. MPEP804.02II.

The Applicants herein file a terminal disclaimer.

In the following, the Applicants will refer to the US 2004/0044747 published application, in order to set out where the Applicants believe the specification as filed rebuts or clarifies an objection or rejection of the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 30-32 recite the limitation driving instructions.

Amended Claim 30 includes the limitations "accessing the Web page", "extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links to one or more area maps and one or more links to one or more traveling instructions for the one or more addresses from the Web page" and "displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses". Amended Claim 32 includes the limitation "wherein the one or more links to one or more area maps and the one or more links to one or more traveling instructions are displayed as a list on the mobile device as maps and traveling instructions."

In the specification as originally filed, the Applicants state "[t]he addresses may be accessed along with a map for locating the address for the users convenience." 20040044747 published application, paragraph [0023], second last sentence. Further, the Applicants state:

"A second link shown created in FIG. 6A is the address for FXPAL which is the link identified by the label "FX Palo Alto Labor...". In addition to the telephone number, a mobile device user will likely find addresses in the Web page desirable so that a map to the address can be displayed for the address location where the user may wish to travel. Thus, in one embodiment m-link parses through the content of the Web page to identify addresses. Links are provided for the identified addresses and listed after telephone numbers on the mobile device display, as illustrated by the link labeled "FX Palo Alto Labor...," in FIG. 6A. Once this link is selected, the FXPAL address is displayed. Services may then be selected for the address including providing a map locating the address." 20040044747, paragraph [0063].

The Applicants also state in the specification as filed "[t]he print service link can further be configured to provide an address link for the print shop along with a map link." 20040044747 published application, paragraph [0083], last sentence.

It is Applicants' position that based on the specification as originally filed at least in paragraphs [0023], [0063], [0083] and Figure 6, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would understand that the Applicants had possession of the claimed invention.

The Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that Claims 30-32 comply with the written description requirement.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16-17, 23-25, 27-28 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,259 to Lincke et al. (hereinafter Lincke), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,701 to Malik et al. (hereinafter Malik).

Claim 16

Claim 16 includes the limitations "extracting only the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user" and "providing only the links and defining names for viewing on the display". The Examiner states that these limitations are taught by Malik col. 4, lines 60-col. 5, lines 30, reproduced below.

8

"Although the disclosed methodology is applicable to "text-only", "hyperlink-only" and other retrieval modes for retrieving selected types of items typically presented on a web page, the present example illustrates the hyperlink-only retrieval mode for retrieving items presented in a hyperlink type format i.e. a presentation type that allows a user to click on the text to retrieve a referenced page or go to a referenced site. In text-only mode, the disclosed methodology could be applied to selectively retrieve text-only skeleton pages without hyperlinks.

In FIG. 3, the "location" or Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") designation in the example is "Targetpage#3.com". Also shown is an exemplary page of "hypertext" which includes a page or more of text 309 including a plurality of "hyperlinks" such as hyperlinks 311 and 315. The hyperlinks are typically set out in bold type and underscored, and often displayed in a contrasting color for easy recognition. The hyperlinks typically comprise a grouping of descriptive words which if selected by a user through the positioning and clicking of a pointer 315 for example, will access the page or site which is designated by the link. The hyperlinks activate an access program to the selected site, unlike the remaining text on the page which merely represents text only without an functional aspect. For example, hyperlink 311 will access a web site through "link #4" and hyperlink 313 will access a web site through "link#12" as illustrated. Through the use of hyperlinks, a user may relatively quickly identify a possible site of interest and click on the hyperlink to immediately access that site from the current page. As can be seen in FIG. 3 however, only one screen is shown and a user may prematurely click on one of the visible links on the first page of a site when a more relevant hyperlink may appear on the next page. If the user clicked on the first visible hyperlink and then discovered it was not really what the user wanted, the user would then have to go back or reload the previous page that included all of the hyperlinks, and page down until a more appropriate hyperlink was identified." Malik, col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 30.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that Malik teaches extracting. A word search indicates that nowhere in the text is the word 'extract' present in Malik. Rather, Malik teaches the 'retrieving' of the page where, when the 'hyperlink-only' mode is used, the hyperlink is underscored, emboldened or colored. This is because Malik intends that the pages will still be presented to a user as before, but where the links are the only entry present and their position on the page is conserved. Malik contends this facilitates the more rapid movement up and down through the links. Importantly, Malik implicitly assumes the pages are displayed on a full screen display. In contrast, the Applicants extract only the links from the content of the Web page such that the links can be viewed on a mobile device display. In addition, the Applicants define names that can be viewed on the mobile device display. Further, the claim explicitly allows 'only the link and the defining name' to be displayed on the mobile device. Neither Lincke nor Malik teach or suggest any of these limitations.

Since Lincke and Malik do not teach or suggest 'extracting only the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user' and 'providing only the links and defining names for viewing on the display', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 16. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 16 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 17

Claim 17 includes the limitation "determining if more than one of the links identifies a single destination, and if so providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display." The Examiner states "[r]egarding dependent claim 17, Lincke in combination with Malik teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the step of providing the links separately from the content comprises the steps of determining if more than one of the links identifies a single destination, and if so providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display (see Malik, col. 4, lines 60-col. 5, line 30)", Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 4, 2nd paragraph. Malik col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 30 is reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Malik teaches this limitation. A word search does not reveal the words 'single' or 'destination' in the cited section. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in Malik this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke and Malik do not teach or suggest 'determining if more than one of the links identifies a single destination, and if so providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 17. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 17 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 27

Claim 27 includes the limitation "extracting the links from the content of the Web page and one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses from the Web page" and "displaying only the links and the one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses extracted on the mobile device and a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the link and the telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses". The Examiner states "Lincke does not teach a web page containing links, or extracting and providing extracting one or more telephone number, fax numbers, addresses and email addresses from the Web page; displaying only the one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers, addresses and

10

email addresses on the mobile device and a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the telephone number, fax number, address and email address; selecting either a telephone number, fax number, address or email address from the one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers, addresses and email addresses displayed on the mobile device; and carrying out the context appropriate service on the selected telephone number, fax number, address or email address", <u>Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 5, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence – page 6, 2nd paragraph.</u> The Examiner states that these limitations are taught by Malik col. 4, lines 60-col. 5, lines 30, reproduced above.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that Malik teaches 'extracting'. A word search indicates that nowhere in the text is the word 'extract' present in Malik. The Applicants respectfully submit that 'extract' refers to a portion of a book or document, separately transcribed; a citation; a quotation (see dictionary.net, http://www.dictionary.net/extract). Rather, Malik teaches the 'retrieving' of the page where when the 'hyperlink-only' mode is used the hyperlink is underscored, in bold or colored. This is because Malik intends that the pages will still be presented to a user as before, but Malik envisions the links are the only entry present and their position on the page is conserved. This facilitates the more rapid movement up and down through the links. However, Malik's system will only work if the pages are displayed on a full screen display. In contrast, by extracting the link, the Applicants can display content of the Web page such that the links can be viewed on the display. In addition, the Applicants display a 'name' that can be viewed on the mobile device display. Further, the claim explicitly allows 'only the links and the one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses extracted on the mobile device and a name' to be displayed on the mobile device. The Examiner does not indicate where Lincke or Malik teach or suggest any of these limitations.

Since neither Lincke nor Malik teach or suggest 'extracting the links from the content of the Web page and one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses from the Web page' and 'displaying only the links and the one or more telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses extracted on the mobile device and a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the link and the telephone numbers, fax numbers and email addresses', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 27. <u>MPEP 2143.03</u>. Accordingly, Claim 27 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 28

Claim 28 includes the limitations 'wherein said extracting is performed without receiving further input from a user'. The Examiner states that this limitation is taught by Malik col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 30, reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Malik teaches this limitation. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke and Malik do not teach or suggest 'wherein said extracting is performed without receiving further input from a user', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 28. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 28 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 30

Claim 30 includes the limitations "extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links to one or more area maps and one or more links to one or more traveling instructions for the one or more addresses from the Web page" and "displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses". The Examiner states that these limitations are taught by Malik col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 30, reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Malik teaches these limitations. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text these limitations are specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke and Malik do not teach or suggest 'extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links to one or more area maps and one or more links to one or more traveling instructions for the one or more addresses from the Web page' and 'displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 30. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 30 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 23-25, 28, 30 and 31

Claims 23-25, 28 and 31 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 16 and 30, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 16 and 30 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lincke in view of Malik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,641 to Synder et al. (hereinafter Snyder).

Claim 18

Claim 18 includes the limitations "defining names for links identified by text in the Web page, wherein the names are summaries of the identifying text using only a portion of the identifying text" and "wherein the defining names for links identified by a non-text image in the Web page by using at least a portion of text in an alternative (ALT) tag for the image if text is provided in an ALT tag associated with the image". The Examiner states that these limitations are taught by Snyder col. 14, lines 1-40, reproduced below.

"Deliberate as well as inadvertant "search engine corruption" sometimes occurs. It may be crucial for marketing or other purposes for a web site to be found in user searches on search engines, and it can be lucrative or otherwise beneficial for a web site operator if his/her site is ranked high in the search results for particular terms. Thus, a great number of website operators have ways to misrepresent the content of their pages. Keywords intended to cause the page to be selected and to rate highly in particular categories can be included and may or may not be displayed. Misleading text can be placed in miniscule font at the bottom of a page or misleading text can be hidden by making it the same color as the background on which it appears. Text can also be placed in "ALT" descriptions of images and graphics, thereby indexed by the crawler but not seen by the user. A particular term can be included one or many times to improve rankings, by one of the foregoing techniques, or by overloading keywords in "META" tags included in web pages and not displayed. Another technique is to temporarily post a page to be textually indexed by the crawler/search engine and then to replace its content after it has been indexed, or similarly, meta-refreshing the web page so as to redirect the user to another page address. According to an aspect of the present invention, the user can visually distinguish pages having undesired content and not waste time on them. Search engine corruption using the aforementioned techniques to provide misleading text is averted due to the visual nature of the present invention.

According to an inventive aspect, a system of the type that indexes or categorizes information on web pages for searching is improved by encoding and providing in the search report 80 a standardized graphic representation 35 of the appearance and rendering

13

of each page at the time that the page is indexed. The graphic representation 35 preferably is in the form of a compressed image of the page, described herein as a snapshot, stored in a standard compressed file graphics format at a location accessible to the search portal process 78. The snapshot is acquired when the page is initially loaded by the crawler 60 for indexing (FIG. 2). The snapshot is rendered, converted to the compressed format and stored. When the subject page is selected in a search (FIG. 3), transmitted to the user are the individual snapshots, which have been stored locally to the search portal processor 78, in association with the index/categorization database. In this way the snapshots 35 of the hit page (which may be one of a number of hits that are reported to user 30) is shown when providing the search report." Snyder, col. 13, line 62-col. 14, line 40.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that Snyder teaches this limitation. Snyder teaches placing text in ALT descriptions of images, but does not teach or suggest using the text in ALT to define a name for a link. Further, Snyder does not teach or suggest using only a portion of the identifying text as a defined name for the link. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text these limitations are specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Snyder do not teach or suggest 'defining names for links identified by text in the Web page, wherein the names are summaries of the identifying text using only a portion of the identifying text' and 'wherein the defining names for links identified by a non-text image in the Web page by using at least a portion of text in an alternative (ALT) tag for the image if text is provided in an ALT tag associated with the image', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 18. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 18 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 19

Claim 19 includes the limitation "further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using only a portion of a URL code for the link when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image". The Examiner states that "[r]egarding dependent claim 19, Lincke in combination with Malik and Snyder teaches the method of claim 18. Snyder further teaches method comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using at least a portion of a URL code for the link when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (see Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40)", Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 9, last paragraph, line 1 – page 10, line 2. Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40 is reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Snyder teaches this limitation. The word 'universal' or 'URL' is not present in the section of Snyder to which the Examiner directs

the Applicants. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Snyder do not teach or suggest 'further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using only a portion of a URL code for the link when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 19. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 19 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 20

Claim 20 includes the limitation "further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image". The Examiner states "[r]egarding dependent claim 20, Lincke in combination with Malik and Snyder teaches the method of claim 18. Snyder further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (see Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40)", Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 10, 1st full paragraph. Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40 is reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Snyder teaches this limitation. While content is discussed in this section, defining names for links based on content is not taught or suggested. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Snyder do not teach or suggest 'further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 20. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 20 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 21

Claim 21 includes the limitation "wherein the content of the documents accessed using the link are titles". The Examiner states that "[r]egarding dependent claim 21, Lincke in combination with Malik and Snyder teaches the method of claim 20, wherein the content of the documents accessed using the link are titles (see Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40)", Office Action,

15

<u>April 13, 2009, page 10, 2nd full paragraph</u>. Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40, is reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Snyder teaches this limitation. While content is discussed in this section, a word search of this section does not find the word 'title'. The Applicants do not understand how this limitation can be taught or suggested when title is not mentioned. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Snyder do not teach or suggest 'wherein the content of the documents accessed using the link are titles', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 21. <u>MPEP 2143.03</u>. Accordingly, Claim 21 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

<u>Claim 22</u>

Claim 22 includes the limitation "further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image". The Examiner states "[r]egarding dependent claim 22, Lincke in combination with Malik and Snyder teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising the step off [sic] defining names for links identified by nontext images in the Web page by using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (see Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40)", <u>Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 10, 3rd full paragraph</u>. Snyder, col. 14, lines 1-40, is reproduced above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that Snyder teaches this limitation. While content is discussed in this section of Snyder, defining names for links based on off-site content is not taught or suggested. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text this limitation is specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Snyder do not teach or suggest 'further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 22. <u>MPEP 2143.03</u>. Accordingly, Claim 22 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

<u>Claims 18-22</u>

Claims 18-22 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claim 16, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 16 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lincke in view of Malik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky).

<u>Claim 26</u>

Claim 26 includes the limitations "selecting a link" and "selecting from a list of context appropriate services displayed on the mobile device, wherein the selected context appropriate service is carried out on the selected link". The Examiner states "[h]owever, they fails [sic] to teach selecting from a list of context appropriate services displayed on the device, wherein the selected context appropriate service is carried out on the selected link", <u>Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 11, 2nd full paragraph, 2nd sentence</u>. The Examiner states "Kanesky [sic] teaches selecting from a list of context appropriate services displayed on the device, wherein the selected context appropriate service is carried out on the selected link. (see Kanesky [sic], col. 15, lines 1-36)", <u>Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 11, 3rd full paragraph</u>.

> "In the example in FIG. 13, unification of links under the same topic (e.g., links marked by the first word at each line) may be done by a web designer of the particular web page. Automatic topic identifications of web content can be done by comparing frequencies of (non-finction) words in titles or texts that are linked to objects. There exists methods for identifying whether two words are semantically related. For example, two words are semantically related if they are linked in the same definition of a word meaning in a vocabulary. This allows to build a graph of semantic similarity for words that can be used for topic identification.
>
> The textual transformation module 902 provides for textual operations on web pages to adapt them to a new size (i.e., display screen and/or window). Possible operations on text and words are: abbreviations, deletions, insertions, movements, zoom, font changes, fitting screen form (e.g., squared, round, triangle) as will be explained, etc. For example in FIG. 13, words HEADLINES and SUMMARIES are abbreviated to HEAD. and SUM., respectively. Examples of movements are pairs HEAD. SUM. Which were placed under BUSINESS and under TECHNOLOGY (in 1503). Examples of deletions are QUOTES and MOTLEY in 1503 (the words "Financial" and "Foot" from 1501 were deleted). These textual transformations can be either specified in instructions (URL/CGI) by web designers

or produced automatically by the semantic interpreter 905. For example, rules for abbreviations of words (e.g., preserve at least 3 or 4 letters of an original word or preserve a root of a word, etc.) may be implemented automatically by the adaptation scheme of the invention. Also, the semantic interpreter module 905 may define what can be deleted or moved. For example, the semantic interpreter 905 can define that "Financial Quotes" and "Motley Foot" links are related to a topic "FINANCE" and based on this information the textual transformation module 902 creates a topic title FINANCE in 1503 and move links QUOTES and MOTLEY under FINANCE, as shown in 1503." Kanevsky, col. 15, lines 1-36.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that Kanevsky teaches these limitations. Kanevsky uses text operations such as abbreviation to adapt the text to the page. Kanevsky does not display context appropriate services on a mobile device, and neither selects a link nor selects a context appropriate service to be performed on the selected link. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner identify where in the above text these limitations are specifically taught or suggested.

Since Lincke, Malik and Kanevsky do not teach or suggest 'selecting from a list of context appropriate services displayed on the mobile device, wherein the selected context appropriate service is carried out on the selected link', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 26. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 26 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 26 directly depends from independent Claim 16, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 16 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lincke in view of Malik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,624 to Narurkar et al. (hereinafter Narurkar).

Claim 29

Narurkar was patented after the Applicants' date of filing and was not published. Therefore, Narurkar is not prior art to the Applicants' invention. Since Lincke and Malik do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 29, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 29. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 29 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 29 directly depends from independent Claim 27, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 27 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lincke in view of Malik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,280 to Nishimura et al. (hereinafter Nishimura).

Claim 32

Claim 32 includes the limitations "extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links to one or more area maps and one or more links to one or more traveling instructions for the one or more addresses from the Web page" and "displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses". The Examiner states "[h]owever, they [Lincke and Malik] fail to teach wherein the one or more links to one or more area maps and the one or more links to one or more driving instructions are displayed as a list on the mobile device as maps and driving instructions" Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 12, 3rd full paragraph, 2nd sentence. The Examiner states that "Nishimura teaches wherein the one or more links to one or more area maps and the one or more links to one or more driving instructions are displayed as a list on the mobile device as maps and driving instructions (see Nishimura col. 38, lines 60-65)", Office Action, April 13, 2009, page 12, 4th full paragraph.

"8. A vehicle navigation apparatus as set forth in claim 7, in which one of said links in said road map data block stored in said microcomputer and in close proximity of said destination link is connected to said leading route end junction of said return travel route of said second optimum travel." Nishimura col. 38, lines 60-65.

The Examiner does not identify where Lincke, Malik or Nishimura teach or suggest 'extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links'. Further, Nishimura does not teach or suggest 'displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses'.

19

Since Lincke, Malik and Nishimura do not teach or suggest 'extracting one or more addresses and one or both one or more links to one or more area maps and one or more links to one or more traveling instructions for the one or more addresses from the Web page' and 'displaying the one or more addresses, one or both the one or more links to the one or more traveling instructions and the one or more links to the one or more area maps together with a name, wherein the name includes a portion of text identifying the addresses', they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 32. <u>MPEP 2143.03</u>. Accordingly, Claim 32 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 32 directly depends from independent Claim 30, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 30 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fee and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __July 13, 2009__   By:___/Anthony G. Craig/_____
                                  Anthony G. Craig
                                  Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer Number 23910